

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. V. No. 20.]

London, Saturday, 19th May, 1804.

[Price 10p]

If pressed, then, I have no hesitation to acknowledge my wish for the return of my Right Honourable Friend [Mr. Pitt] to office. My Right Honourable Friend is incapable of playing so dishonourable a game as that to which the Honourable Member [Mr. Sheridan] has alluded [that of undermining the minister, whom he himself had recommended, in order to thrust him out and take his place]. "No man was ever less likely to furnish, by his conduct, any grounds for such an imputation. Never did young ambition labour so much to attach popularity and power, as my Right Honourable Friend has laboured to detach them. He has laboured not for fame but for 'obscurity' !!!—MR. CANNING'S SPEECH, December 8, 1802.

LOYALTY OF ROMAN CATHOLICS.

SIR,—The eager impatience of your correspondent C. R. to find in your Register a defence of Lord Redesdale, or a refutation of the British Observer, naturally attracted my attention. When I found, by reading a few lines of his letter, that he had himself undertaken the task, I own, Sir, I did expect some justification of that noble lord on religious or political grounds, or something like a reply to my own remarks. But these expectations, however rational, have been completely disappointed. The author of the letter brings before us an unconnected series of trite objections against the Catholic religion, objections which have repeatedly been made, and as often fully refuted. After a late discussion of these topics between two eminent divines of the church of Rome, and of the Establishment, it is somewhat surprising, that the patience of the Public should be so soon put to a second trial. As knowledge and discrimination are not widely diffused among the bulk of mankind, as many deem an objection unanswerable, because it receives no answer, as all do not possess that sense and liberality, which are necessary in such a discussion, I think it highly advisable to correct the misstatements of your correspondent, and to rectify his errors. As his representation of Catholic doctrine and practices can have no tendency but to excite alarm, it appears to me, that the man who steps forward to allay this uneasiness, by correctly stating, what is evidently misrepresented, is a benefactor to his country.—Your correspondent candidly acknowledges, that he is little skilled in the history of popery. In this sentiment we both most perfectly agree; and of the truth of this acknowledgment every sentence offers a confirmation. It is stated, that the public professions of loyalty made by the Catholic bishops are contrary to the authorised doctrines of their church, the acts of their Popes, the explanations of their doctors, and the continued practice of people,

priests, and princes. How these formidable charges are substantiated the reader will be curious to learn. As to the avowed doctrine of the Catholic church on the subject of loyalty, the 3d chapter of the 4th council of Lateran is referred to as conclusive evidence. It is extremely unpleasant, Sir, to tell a gentleman, who, perhaps, like myself, may have devoted his days and nights to literary pursuits, that he wholly misconceives the meaning of the canon, and that he shews a complete ignorance of the circumstances of the time in which it was framed.—About the close of the 12th, and the beginning of the 13th centuries, heretical opinions of the most dangerous nature and tendency were rapidly gaining ground, and spreading the utmost disorder in several countries of Europe. These errors assumed a variety of forms, and were propagated by leaders of different denominations. Such were the Waldenses, the Cathari, the new Arians, the new Manicheans. The most dangerous of these sects was, unquestionably, that of the Albigenses, who, besides disturbing by their disorders the religious establishment of their country, broached doctrines hostile to all government, and to the very existence of civil society. Among a dark catalogue of errors, they condemned matrimony, but indulged in excesses of the most indelicate and the most atrocious nature. Against these pestiferous members of society, the civil power had frequently proceeded with the utmost severity, but without effect. To repress their disorders in the most efficacious manner, the 4th council of Lateran was called in the year 1215, and at this assembly assisted, not only the usual proportion of bishops and dignified clergy, but ambassadors from almost every sovereign in Europe. Those of the Emperor, of the King of France, England, Hungary, and Arragon are particularly mentioned in the acts of the council. On that occasion it was decreed to excommunicate the heretics of the time,

and to deliver them up to the civil power to receive the punishment due to their crimes. Then follows the clause containing the objected words: "If any temporal lord shall not obey, within a year, it shall be signified to the Pope, who shall from that time absolve his subjects from their fidelity, and give up his country to the possession of the Catholics." The statement of this transaction shews, that it was not an ecclesiastical usurpation of civil power, but a joint effort of church and state to repress disorders destructive to the interests of both. Such is the observation of Fleury, a writer by no means partial to the civil pretensions of the Popes. "The church," says he, "would appear by this canon to invade the civil power; but we must recollect that at this council many sovereigns were represented by their ambassadors, who admitted these decrees in the names of their masters" (Hist. Ecclesias. Tom. X. Liv. 77. § 47). Indeed it requires not the learning of Fleury to answer the proposed objection. If your correspondent had taken the pains to turn to the 42d chapter of the same council, he would have found an explicit avowal of the independence both of the civil and spiritual powers. The words are remarkable and deserve to be transcribed. "*Sicut volumus ut jura clericorum non usurpent laici, ita velle debemus ne clerici jura sibi vindicent laicorum.*" As this 42d canon contains an acknowledgment of the power of sovereigns, and as the 3d canon relates only to a co-operation of the civil and ecclesiastical powers for the purpose of repressing crimes punishable by the laws of this and of every civilized country, I expect from the candour of your correspondent a formal retraction of a rash and unfounded opinion. (See Concilia. Edit. Labbe Paris 1671. Tom. IV. p. 118, 240; also Fleury's Hist. Eccles. Tom. XVI. Liv. 76 and 77).—As your correspondent has failed in establishing the "precept," let us see whether he will succeed better in proving the "practice." He asserts, that Pius V. issued a bull absolving Elizabeth's subjects from their allegiance, and forbidding obedience to her under pain of excommunication. The fact is undoubtedly true, but let us examine whether it will authorise the conclusion which he has thought proper to draw. The Roman Pontiffs have always claimed a spiritual power and a supreme jurisdiction over the whole Catholic church, and Catholics are obliged by their religion to admit the claim. Some Popes have been found to exceed the limits of the spiritual power, and to interfere in the civil

concerns of sovereigns, but their pretensions have been as often resisted by Catholics themselves. Of what kind is this act, by which the Pope attempted to deprive Elizabeth of the crown? Unquestionably of the latter description. Had his Holiness confined himself to the sentence of excommunication, he would not have exceeded his duty; for as he can enforce obedience in matters relating to faith, morals, and discipline, it certainly is in his power to declare who are members of his church, and who deserve to be removed from the pale of his communion. But when that Pontiff attempted to deprive Elizabeth of her temporal right, he certainly proceeded to a deed not within the limits of his jurisdiction, and not justified by the example of the most eminent and most illustrious of his predecessors. This solitary instance, therefore, cannot be produced as an example of the practice of the Popes, much less of the authorised usages of the Catholic religion, no more than the attempts of Charles I. to raise money without the consent of Parliament can be referred to as a practice permitted by the British constitution. Besides, let it be remembered that the Popes never proposed to the faithful the acknowledgment of this pretended right, as an essential term of communion, that for many ages it has been discontinued, and has grown obsolete, and that Catholics never thought the admission of it a matter of conscientious obligation. It is a notorious fact, that at the present day, the Catholics of the United Kingdom have formally disavowed it by a solemn appeal to the Almighty. (See the Irish Oath, 1774, and the English of 1778 and 1791).—The loyal conduct of the English Catholics during the period to which your correspondent alludes, is a proof of the purity of their religious doctrine. Let him examine their behaviour with a critical eye at a period when the kingdom was threatened with invasion by a powerful Catholic sovereign, commanding the whole force of the Spanish monarchy; let him bear in his mind, that they were smarting under the severest sufferings; that they were in a state of persecution for professing the religion of their fathers; exposed to fines, imprisonment, exile, and death; that the scaffold was perpetually flowing with the blood of their clergy, one hundred and forty of whom suffered death during this reign on account of the exercise of their priestly functions. (Mem. Miss. Pr. Vol. I. and II. passim. Dodd's Church Hist. Vol. II. Art. Elizabeth).—Let him likewise reflect on the tenor of the bull to which he has referred, and then determine what could have given birth to an

examplified display of loyalty, but their strong sense of duty to God and their Sovereign? Of the fact no doubt can be entertained: even Hume, whose history exhibits instances of unpardonable inaccuracies and omissions respecting the Catholics, bears ample testimony in their favour on this occasion. "Some gentlemen," says he, "of that sect" (he majority of the nation at that time!) "entered themselves as volunteers in the fleet or army; some equipped ships at their own charge, and gave the command of them to Protestants; others were active in animating their tenants, and vassals, and neighbours to the defence of the country." (History of England, Vol. V. Eliz. Chap. 42. page 338. Edit. 1773). — When, Sir, the meritorious conduct of English Catholics at the period under consideration is viewed in its true light, and with all the circumstances which I have mentioned, it will be found to stand almost unexampled in the history of mankind. Let it be compared with the behaviour of those nations that adopted the reformed doctrines, and the contrast will be irresistibly striking. What produced those extraordinary convulsions during the course of the 16th century in Sweden, in Germany, in the Low Countries, in Switzerland, and Geneva, but the levelling and jacobinical principles of the reforming doctors? Who excited rebellion in the kingdom of Scotland at that period, and brought affairs to such a alarming crisis, that an unfortunate queen was constrained to seek an asylum in a neighbouring country, where, by the unrelenting malice of a rival, she found a prison and a scaffold? They were subjects initiated in the new doctrines, and graduates in the schools of the rights of man. Let the conduct of the Catholics be compared with theirs, and I am confident, that it will receive additional splendour from the contrast. — Your correspondent proceeds to complain, that many Catholic writers have defended the deposing doctrine. Without pretending to justify the opinions of those doctors, it is certainly not unfair to state their sentiments, and to see how far an Englishman will consider them as deserving of censure. If a sovereign should violate the fundamental laws of his realm, if he should proceed so far as to defeat the purposes of government and dissolve the bonds of society, these doctors did not in that case deem the people authorised to revolt. No: they required that the affair in the last resort should be submitted to the judgment of the sovereign Pontiff, and if he deemed it desperate, they allowed him a power of depos-

ing the king, and of absolving his subjects from their allegiance. Such was the deposing doctrine as maintained by some Catholic divines. The notions were purely speculative, and served to exercise the ingenuity of the disputant in the schools, or of the student in the closet. — But this power, even in the form in which I have described it, is now universally exploded by Catholics, and in the United Kingdom the rejection of it is confirmed by the solemn sanction of an oath. But with what grace, let me ask, can British subjects condemn so very pointedly the conduct of their Catholic ancestors on this account? Their forefathers held, it is true, a speculative opinion on the subject, but the descendants have actually carried these notions into effect. Without the formality of recurring to the Pope, an English King has been actually deposed, and the revolution which it occasioned is celebrated as the most glorious epoch in our history. I think, if we view this grand event with enthusiasm, we may afford to shew some indulgence to the speculative opinions of our forefathers. — With respect to the commission said to have been given to Campion and Parsons by the legates to assassinate Elizabeth, your correspondent may rest assured that it is entirely without foundation. Those two able divines arrived in England in 1580, solely for the purpose of exercising the functions of the ministry, and on that account Campion was apprehended and executed at Tyburn, Dec. 1, 1581, a fate which Parsons narrowly escaped by leaving the kingdom. (Dodd, Vol. II. p. 137 and 402). — The course of my observations leads me to examine the celebrated gunpowder plot, which, says your correspondent, was contrived by the same hands, "the Legates of those days." This statement indicates a greater degree of credulity, ignorance, or misrepresentation than ever influenced the opinions of those who have been most hostile to the Catholic cause. No charge was made against the Pope or his Legates on this subject. It has indeed been said, that Pope Clement VIII. a few years before, published two briefs, addressed to the English Catholics, exhorting them not to obey the successor of Elizabeth, if he should be a heretic. But these briefs never had an existence; this report we must therefore rank among many foul calumnies which were invented to discredit the Catholic cause. As to the body of the English Catholics, the King himself, in his speech to Parliament, acquitted them of every species of guilt in the transaction. Sixteen persons only were implicated in the act of attainder which

passed, and nine appear to have been the great actors in the dreadful scene. No Catholic of any great consideration was privy to the plan, and the conspirators by no means bore the reputable character which some bigotted historians have given them. Garnet the priest was, indeed, made acquainted with the design in the sacrament of confession, and attempted to dissuade him who consulted him, from partaking in the plot, by every argument in his power. But the knowledge, which by all laws of heaven and earth, he could make use of only in the sacred tribunal, proved fatal to him; for he was informed against by the man who consulted him, and executed May 3, 1606. (Dodd, Vol. II. p. 395.) — By what logic the horrid crimes of a few daring men can be either attributed to the religion which they profess, or be charged to the community to which they belong, we are still doomed to inquire. The infernal design can no more be denominated a Catholic plot than the late wretched attempt of Despard and his associates, to overturn the government, can be called a Protestant conspiracy. — But, Sir, what will be the surprise of your correspondent when he learns, perhaps, for the first time, that there are writers of respectability both among Protestants as well as Catholics, who ascribe the whole infernal machination to the secret suggestion of Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, the Secretary of State. He is accused, and the accusation will not easily be refuted, of having engaged some men of desperate fortunes and of no religion, though nominally Catholics, to undertake the work of darkness, in order to raise the hatred of the nation against that respected body of men, and to ruin them in the estimation of the King. His father, Lord Burleigh, had recurred to a similar stratagem to bring the Queen of Scots to the scaffold, and the son inherited every quality which rendered him fit for an undertaking of the same kind. Indeed, the improbability that any one but a secret agent of Cecil should write the letter to Lord Monteagle ten days before the meeting of Parliament, the delay of the Secretary in communicating it to the King, the circumstance of postponing the search of the vaults till the eve of the meeting of Parliament, of shooting the four leading conspirators, when they might easily have been apprehended by the sheriff, the sudden death of Tresham in prison, who was known to have had some communication with Cecil not long before, all this gives a very singular appearance to this horrid transaction. Osborne expressly calls it “a neat device of the Secretary,” and Hig-

gons entertains no doubt on the subject. “This design, says he, was hammered in ‘the forge of Cecil.’” I believe that what I have said is sufficient to repress all clamour against the Catholics on this subject, and to induce the legislature to erase from the calendar the ridiculous holiday of the 5th of November. (See an ample discussion on this subject in Milner's Letters to a Prebendary, Letter VII. 2d Edit. Osborne's Hist. Mem. of James I. Higgon's Short View, Dodd, Vol. II. p. 331). — The charge brought against the Pope, of forbidding the Catholics of that period to take the oath of allegiance to James, is another instance of misrepresentation. He never ordered them to refuse a fair test of allegiance, but forbade them to take a proposed oath, which contained sentiments inconsistent with their religious principles. A similar affair happened to the English Catholics a very few years ago; conscientious scruples were urged against an oath under the discussion of Parliament; the proposed test was accordingly set aside, and another substituted by the humanity of the legislature. — The account of priests being found killed at Edge-Hill fighting against Charles I. is a foolish story related by Echard and some writers who appear scarcely to credit it themselves; and if it were true, it would only prove that these unfortunate men transgressed the canons of their church by which they are forbidden to carry arms. — When your correspondent says, that Catholics were always conspiring against William III. and George I. I suspected some typographical error in that part of his letter. There were three conspiracies against William, and all conducted by Protestants, by those whigs who had called him to the throne; and as to the rebellion in the reign of George I. it was not peculiar to Catholics more than to Protestants. (See Smollett, 4th Vol. 4to. Edit. Reign of William and George I.) — I have thus refuted, Sir, the various inaccuracies, errors, and misrepresentations which your correspondent C. R. has accumulated from our history respecting Catholics. The review of his unwarrantable attacks on Irish loyalty must be postponed to a future occasion, as I am fearful of trespassing too much on your patience by a more lengthened letter. I cannot dismiss this subject without distinctly assuring you, your correspondent, and the Public, that, in pursuing the discussion, I am actuated by the honourable motives of espousing the cause of injured innocence, of counteracting the designs of those who are attempting to irritate four millions of his Majesty's subjects, and

of pro
which,
n-cessa
penden
BRITIS

EM
Procee
Repu
mitted
forin
rank
FRES
and t
to the

Carr
to the
He set
speak a
endeav
in deliv
exhibit
in favo
referre
structio
minatio
ment
questio
dignity
heredit
was to
his ser
berty?
destroy
Franc
voted
finued
follow
sistent
the or
tablish
and t
my de
comm
orator
form
blish
from
infe
one
a sur
lity.
histor
tions
der
unw
of A
had
narc
form

of promoting that harmony and concord, which, at this critical period, are peculiarly necessary to secure the liberties and independence of the British Empire.—THE BRITISH OBSERVER.—May 11, 1804.

EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH.

Proceedings in the Tribunal of the French Republic, relative to the proposition, submitted to the Tribunal by CURÉE, for conferring on NAPOLEON BUONAPARTÉ the rank and title of EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH, and for making the said rank and title hereditary in his family, according to the laws of primogeniture.

SITTING OF MAY 1, 1804.

Carnot (being the only one who objected to the proposition) mounted the Tribune. He set out with declaring, that being to speak against the motion of Curée, he should endeavour to preserve the same moderation in delivering his opinion, which had been exhibited by the Tribunes who had spoken in favour of the motion. He added, that he referred those who wished to put a bad construction on his sentiments to the rigid examination of his conduct since the commencement of the revolution. He took up the question of conferring on Buonaparté the dignity of Emperor for life, and making it hereditary in his family. He asked, if it was to grant the First Consul a reward for his services to offer him the sacrifice of liberty? He asked, whether it was not to destroy Buonaparté's own work to make France his private patrimony?—"I voted against the Consulate for life," continued the orator, "and I will not this day follow a different course. I will be consistent with myself; but the moment that the order of things which is proposed is established, I will be the first to conform to it, and to yield to the new authority proofs of my deference. May all the members of the community follow the same example." The orator went on to the examination of the form of government proposed to be established. He cited a number of examples from the history of Rome, and drew, as an inference from them, that a government by one individual was not in the smallest a sure pledge of its stability or its tranquillity. He applied the same inference to the history of France, where intestine commotions and civil discords so often existed under the government of princes, weak or unworthy of governing.—"After the peace of Amiens," continued Carnot, "Buonaparté had the choice between a republic or a monarchy; but he had sworn to defend the former, and to respect the wishes of France,

which had made him their guardian. Now it was proposed to make of that power a property, of which, at present, only the administration is possessed.—The Romans were most jealous of their liberty, and Camillus Fabius and Cincinnatus only saved the country because they relinquished the power which had been confided to them after they had saved their country. But the liberty of Rome perished as soon as Cæsar wished to usurp absolute power."—He cited the example of the United States. It was reserved for the New World to shew to the Old the practicability of a nation's enjoying liberty, and the rising prosperity of the people. The destinies to which they appeared to be called left no doubt remaining of the existence of that truth. After discussing a variety of general principles, Carnot made some particular observations. "Will" (said he) "the opinion of the public functionaries be the free wish of the whole nation? Will there not be inconveniences attending the expression of an opposite sentiment? Is the liberty of the press so much restrained and degraded that it will be impossible to make, in the public prints, the most respectful remonstrances against the proposed arrangement?—The orator considered the question in another point of view. He asked, if the expulsion of the Bourbons at all involved the necessity of a new dynasty; if the establishment of that dynasty would not place obstacles in the way of a general peace; if it would be recognized by foreign powers, and if in case of a refusal to recognize it arms would necessarily be resorted to, and for an empty title the security of the French nation would not perhaps be endangered? This is not the only means which the existing government has of consolidating itself. The means of this consolidation consists in adherence to justice. Far be it from me here to make any particular application, or to cast any blame on the operations of government. Such a thought has no place in my heart.—Is liberty then disclosed to man only that it may never be enjoyed? No! I cannot consent to regard it as a mere chimera, and my heart tells me that its government is easy. In conclusion, said the orator—I am ready to sacrifice my personal opinion to the interests of my country. My respect for the law will remain unalterable, and I desire above all things to see every opinion, and every sentiment united against our eternal, our implacable enemy, that enemy which is now meditating universal oppression. I vote against the motion.

Faure next mounted the Tribune. He

applied himself to the refutation of Carnot's speech. He asked, if he had well manifested his respect for the law, by reminding them that he had on a preceding occasion voted against the Consulship for life, sanctioned by the vote of more than a million of Frenchmen? He asked him, if he had forgotten the regime of 1793, and that horrible Decemviral Committee which, in cold blood, signed arrests for death and proscriptions? and he was astonished at hearing of opposition to that proposition which alone could prevent the return of such miseries. We are not here to consider the interests of an individual family, but the interests of the whole nation. Here Faure entered into an examination of the State of France in 1789 and its present situation. He inquired what were the propositions contained in the loose draught of the Constituent Assembly, and he found their completion in the form of government, which it was now proposed to establish. He supported the motion.

Arnould began in the following terms the speech which he also delivered in favour of the motion:—What is this fatality which has seized our colleague, which renders him the passive witness of the outrages of the Committees of Public Safety, which carries him to the Directory, and cannot furnish him with the means of doing good to the people which on the 18th Fructidor renders him the victim of the events of that day, and does not permit him to perceive the share which Pichegru then had in the conspiracy formed against France?—Albison, Grenier, Chabot, (de L'Allier), Deletre and Challand, severally spoke in favour of the motion.—Carion-Nizas refuted the opinion of Carnot. His speech will be published at the end of the one he delivered yesterday.

SITTING OF MAY 2, 1804.

The order of the day was called for the continuation of the discussion on the motion of Curée.—Chassison contended that the intention of the French had always been to establish a monarchical form of government. The wish formed in 1789 was now to be fulfilled, and no person than Buonaparté could better fulfil this wish, which will constitute the happiness of France and our posterity. He voted for the motion, and six copies of his speech were ordered to be printed.

PERREE formed the wish dictated to him by his sincerity and his conscience. He added a few words to corroborate what had been said, to prove how well Buonaparté was worthy the dignity to which the French people called him. He particularly directed his observations to shew what a powerful

guarantee posterity would possess in the hereditary succession proposed. "The latest posterity of the head of the government," said he, "will seek, in the history of Buonaparté, the example which they ought to follow. They will respect his glory, and never shall our posterity have reason to reproach us for the wish which we form this day."—The speech was ordered to be printed.

Carret and Delpierre joined their wishes to that of their colleagues. This is not the time, said Delpierre, when the people were the property of Kings. The interests of both are now common. Their repose, their stability, and their happiness are henceforth inseparable.

Fayard—I know that the First Consul, the august head of the government, has the wishes of the French people. The pens of the eloquent are employed in celebrating his glory; and posterity, which is the judge of great men, will only re-echo the language of the age in which he lived. I know the place which he occupies in their hearts; I know, if I can judge by myself, the devotion which he merits, and with which he has inspired you. I know all the rights which his eminent services give him to the dignity of Emperor, and to have it made hereditary in his family. But let us examine abstractedly, from all personal feelings of gratitude and love, if the unity and hereditary succession of the Chief Consul, be consistent with the government of France.—Different states have a right to that form of government which they enjoy, according to principles invariable as that nature from which they originate. In vain political maladies affect and suspend those principles for a moment. The crisis ceases, and nature resumes her rights. It is the nature of things, that a country of vast extent, whose security is not guaranteed by its physical position, and whose relations with its neighbours incessantly menace its tranquillity, ought to be governed by one head. Rome, at its birth, had Kings, because the states which surrounded were governed by Kings. Rome, after conquering her neighbours, expelled the Kings and created Consuls. When her power had gone beyond the limits of her territories, when she had to combat nations far removed from the centre of her dominions, even the excessive love of liberty could not prevent the ruin of the republic, and Emperors were elevated to the throne.—Happy would have been that great nation if the first of their Emperors had, as he had it in his power, made the government hereditary in his family. The scenes which covered the throne with blood—the civil

wars w
precipi
sullied
ters of
to drea
narchy
substitu
must
Buona
to prec
the in
this el
and th
ought
had, as
service
it with
ample
This is
not en
It is in
prospe
which
them
same
him w
that a
before
of su
succe
men,
and th
not to
the ri
which
regret
asters
line
famil
is the
and I
pire
man
the s
to Fr
Co
tion
salut
the a
Sa
the
con
conc
the
we
the
foun
deri
by
bet
the

wars which desolated that vast empire, and precipitated its downfall, would not have sullied the page of the history of these masters of the world. But one great error led to dreadful abuses. On the ruins of a monarchy destroyed, an attempt was made to substitute a monarchical government. France must have been destroyed, if the genius of Buonaparté had not created the Consulship, to precede for a few years the creation of the imperial dignity.—He is called to this elevated post by the unanimous wish, and this wish is the first sentiment which ought to give rise to military services.—He had, as Consul, the power of performing vast services, and you have seen that he has used it with a degree of success of which no example is afforded in the history of the world. This is enough for his own glory, but it is not enough for the happiness of France.—It is in the nature of things, that if empires prosper under a great man, the moment which deprives them of his services menaces them with some dreadful explosion, if the same moment does not substitute in his place him who is to be his successor. It is then that ambition becomes enflamed, and long before ambition prepares in secret the means of supplanting rivals.—Long disputes, succeeded by civil wars, agitate the minds of men, disturb for ages the union of citizens, and the people are often so unfortunate as not to see who is the most worthy among the rival candidates to receive the sceptre of which death has bereaved the object of their regret.—What then can prevent these disasters? A constitutional law which fixes the line of succession, and which gives to the family of the Chief the new dynasty.—This is the object of the motion under discussion, and I assent to it, persuaded that if the empire is the price of the virtues of the great man who is called to the imperial dignity, the succession to it by the family guarantees to France ages of glory and of repose.

Costas endeavoured to prove that the motion was one founded on utility, that it was salutary and patriotic. He also replied to the arguments used yesterday by Carnot.

Savoie Rollen said, absolute monarchy is the most degrading of systems—monarchy connected with the representative system conciliated political and civil liberty. In the excessive stage of civilization to which we are arrived, there can be no stability in the government if it is arbitrary, but if it is founded on law, it is incorruptible. Frederic said, that laws could not succeed except by the preservation of a proper equilibrium betwixt the power of the government and the liberty of the people. What Frederic

thought, Napoleon is about to execute. I vote for the motion of order, which goes to unite hereditary power to the representative government.

Beauvais obtained leave to make a motion of order, the object of which was—1. To declare that the discussion is closed—2dly, To decide that the reporter of the commission shall be authorised to-morrow to make his motion on Curée's motion of order.—Both these motions were agreed to.

SITTING OF MAY 3, 1804.

The Tribunal, having heard the report of the Special Commission, appointed to consider of the proposition made by Citizen Curée, have resolved:—1st That Napoleon Buonaparté, First Consul, shall be proclaimed Emperor of the French, and in that quality be charged with the government of France.—2dly, That the title of Emperor, together with the Imperial Powers, shall be hereditary in his family, in the male line, and in the order of primogeniture.—3dly The Constituted Authorities, in forming the necessary regulations for the establishment of the hereditary powers, shall make all due provisions for preserving equality, liberty, and the rights of the people.—4thly. The present vote shall be carried to the Senate by a deputation of six members, who are to explain to it the motives which have induced the Tribunal to take this resolution.

FOREIGN OFFICIAL PAPERS.

REPORT OF THE FRENCH GRAND JUDGE.

(Continued from p. 686.)

No. II. Report of the 2d interview of MR. ROSEY with Mr. Drake.

On the 4th Germinal I arrived at Munich, at 6 o'clock in the evening, and alighted at Mr. Drake's, Minister of England; he lodged me at his house, in a chamber on the same floor with his own apartment, as had been agreed upon at our former interview. Enraged Jacobin as I was supposed to be, he received me with the most affectionate regards, and I presented him with the letter of my pretended general, with a request to answer it immediately which he did the next day. As this answer contained the principal details of our conversation, I shall content myself with giving a succinct result of it.—On Mr. Drake's asking me what news there was in France, I answered, that events had never yet been so favourable for us; that the arrests of different royalists had cast an impenetrable veil over our secret projects, and we were rejoiced to find, that not a single Jacobin had been apprehended, &c &c. "I believe with you," replied Mr. Drake, "that you are secure from being suspected, and I have no doubt that every stroke which you make is directed with a certainty of success; but remember to recommend it to your general, that it is essential to unite all parties in the first operations that he shall undertake, and that he must present an imposing mask to the Consul; on this occasion he will be able to employ the royalist party with the greatest advan-

tage.' I observed to Mr. Drake, that my general was entirely of his opinion, but that the committee could not bring itself to unite to such an excellent cause a party so contrary to its principles, &c. &c.—'Make your use of it at all events,' said he to me, as he was walking in his garden, 'and when you have overthrown B——, it will be very easy to purge yourself of all that are not of your party, as you have frequently done in the course of the revolution.'—It was necessary for me to consider the task in which I had engaged, and the utility of my mission to my country, to enable me to restrain the indignation that I felt on the occasion. I felt myself powerfully urged to divulge my real name to the wretch, and to demand satisfaction, with my sword in my hand, for all the calumny that he had dared to express and think. However, I governed my resentment; the conversation then languished for a time, but Drake soon renewed it.—Remember' said he, 'support the idea that I threw out to your general; an augmentation of pay must be promised to the regiments on which you can rely. I will furnish, for some months, all this expense, and you may hereafter supply them from the confiscations of your party. I should have wished that your general would have waited a little before he began his first operations; but, since he thinks the present moment so favourable, he is anxious to get possession of Huningue, which is not remote from the centre of your operations. I intend to fix myself at Fribourg, to be able to give you prompt and certain assistance. As to the citadel of Strasburgh, we must think no more of it; it is too distant. I believe that your general will not have failed to make a powerful party in the army, to produce a diversion, for without that, B—— would be able to fight you with advantage; all the means which he possesses to oppose you must be previously calculated, in order to render his efforts abortive; but profit, when the occasion shall offer, of the trouble in which the rest of his partisans shall be plunged. Destroy them without pity; pity is not the virtue of a politician.'—Mr. Drake insisted very much that my general should send Mr. Muller to him. 'He is indispensably necessary to me; I want him very much to put me in possession of the present course of affairs, and to inform me who are of your party, for without that I shall not be able to justify myself to my own government, which will be desirous of knowing the names of the principal persons, when it is to furnish you with such considerable sums of money.' Mr. Drake gave me a sum, amounting to 74,976 livres in gold. 'It is all that I can do for you at present,' (he said) 'but I shall send soon to Mr. Spencer Smith, at Stutgard, who will furnish you with a much larger sum; I give you a letter for him, and a passport as an English courier, charged with dispatches for Cassel, as, in that character, it will not be necessary for you to present yourself to the French Envoy, who watches our most minute actions. You will say nothing to Mr. Smith as to what has passed between us; you may, however, satisfy his curiosity respecting the news in France.'—I then took leave of Mr. Drake (Monday, the 25th instant), and entered my post-chaise, which was brought to the gate of this hotel at half past five. I had previously had for Stutgard: I had, in fact, had the same past one in the afternoon, and I had, in fact, I stopped at the Golden Lion Hotel, where I was conducted to the house of Mr. Spencer Smith, where I was announced under the name of Mr.

fevre. His first reception of me was cold and accompanied with an air of suspicion. I then gave him the letter from Mr. Drake, and no sooner was he informed who I was, than he overwhelmed me with civilities. He begged me to excuse the ungracious manner in which I was received; 'for,' (said he) 'I do not consider myself here as in a state of security. I assure you, that for some days past I have received no one but with a pistol in my hand; I am not upon a bed of roses. I regard myself as an out-post, and I declare to you, that if B—— required that I should be arrested, the Elector of Wirtemberg, though his wife is a Princess of England, would instantly deliver me up, without giving me the least previous notice; for he already entertains some doubts as to the nature of my occupation here; and he is actually afraid that it may compromise him with the Consul.' He informed himself with much apparent interest of the affairs of France, and told me that the arrest of the Duc D'Enghien had greatly disconcerted him; that he was very much affected by the misfortunes of Pichegru; and that England had with great reason formed sanguine expectations from the mission of a man at once so popular and so full of talent. 'I knew him very well,' he repeated, with great emotion, 'because it was the lieutenant of my brother who disembarked him on the Coast of France, I flattered myself that he would have been able to escape, but we must reckon no more upon that, since it appears to be certain that he has been apprehended.' He earnestly requested me to write a letter to Strasburgh to Madame Franck, the banker, to desire her to forward hereafter all letters which she should receive addressed to Baron De Herbert, a German officer. She may forward them to me under the false cover of the son of George Henry Keller, banker, at Stutgard: I am the more anxious to receive them, because some among them may be from Pichegru.' He desired me also to inform myself of Madame Henrietta de Tromelin, whose husband he had known at Constantinople; he had the very great kindness to inform me that his assumed name was De Blond, and he appeared to derive no considerable consequence, in his own opinion, from the intrigues he had carried on under that denomination. The secretary of this Mr. Smith is M. Pericaud, formerly in the service of the Bishop of Séz; this emigrant entertained me for a long time with his lamentations, and quite overcame me with the horrible actions he recounted of the Chief of the French nation. Mr. Drake, Mr. Spencer Smith, and M. Pericaud, let me know that they should have been most completely tired with the dulness of Munich and Stutgard, if it had not been for the occupation afforded them by the affairs of France; they boasted, however, that they could draw very considerable sums from the English government.—'Trust in your friends,' said Mr. Spencer Smith to me, 'there are bills of exchange for 113,150 livres, and I will send whatever they may want, but, *par Dieu* they must strike home for it.' At this moment he presented me with a pair of pistols, of the manufacture of Versailles: 'You may,' said he, 'make an advantageous use of these little friendly twins, for they never miss.' I at first hesitated to receive them, but I considered myself as an officer of artillery, who assumes a disguise to acquire a knowledge of an enemy's town; every kind of mask becomes him, he stifles his sensibility, and sees nothing but the order of his general, and the object of his mission. I took leave of Mr. Spencer Smith the 9th

instant. One of his domestics brought me the post-horses, and harnessed them to my chaise at four o'clock in the afternoon. I proceeded to Strasburgh the following day, and continued my route for Paris, where I arrived on the 14th inst. It is in vain for me to attempt a description of the sentiments of hatred and rage with which these monsters are animated against our country. The only hope that sustains them, is to see us armed one against the other. There is no occupation so vile or atrocious, for which they are not fitted: at the same time their cowardice is extreme; the shadow of a brave man is alone sufficient to sink them into the earth; they pass their life in forming plots, and which is the natural effect of criminal habits, they continually imagine themselves surrounded with dangers. Whether it is that in the courts friendly to France, and that are under essential obligations to the First Consul, they are not regarded with a favourable eye; whether it is that their real characters have been discovered by the inhabitants of the cities where they reside, and that they perceive that all public opinion is against them; whether it is that their own minds every moment inform them, that the man who respects nothing has no claim to respect; they seem beat down by the weight of public contempt, and are marked with the ineffable opprobrium which is attached to their names.—(Signal)——

ROSEY.

No. III. is the copy of a passport given by Mr. Drake to this informer, under the name of Lebrun.

No. IV. contains the copies of four bills of exchange, to the amount above specified, given to Citizen Rosey by Mr. Spencer Smith.

Nos. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. and X. are copies or extracts of the letters referred to in the Grand Judge's Report.

Letter from the French Minister of Marine and Colonies to the Maritime Prefects and to the Commissary Gen. of Marine at Antwerp. Dated Paris, 23d April, 1804; signed, DECREES.

There are no means, Citizen Prefect, which our enemies leave unemployed, in order to obtain intelligence from the ports of the republic, and to procure information of the state of our maritime force as well as of its movements.—I have just received information of a new manœuvre, which they practise, the effects of which it is necessary to guard against.—There are few neutral vessels bound for the ports of France which, on the eve of entering, are not met, and visited by English cruisers. The object of these visits is, not only to learn the destination and cargo of the ships, but it appears that these visiting vessels almost always take one or more of the crew out of each neutral, which they replace by an equal number of spies, whose continuance in the port lasts as long as that of the ship.—However great the precautions may have been, which you have hitherto prescribed relative to neutrals admitted into the ports, it is possible they may not be sufficient to frustrate this manœuvre, and therefore for this purpose you must use the following means.—You will recommend that a very rigorous examination shall be made of the crews of all neutrals which may come into the ports of your district; and if from this visit it should result that any Englishman or other suspicious person is found on board, he must be immediately arrested, as well as the rest of the crew they must be separately interrogated, and with every precaution necessary to the discovery of the truth.—Should a captain of a neutral

vessel be convicted of having received on board and introduced into France men sent from English cruisers, without having made such declaration on his arrival, he will be treated as an accomplice *d'espionnage*, and his vessel confiscated.—In order that no pretext of ignorance may be alleged by the neutrals to evade the rigour of these arrangements, it is desirable that they should receive the utmost publicity.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH. — The change, which has conferred this title on Buonaparté, is important in many respects. It will not add much, perhaps, to the power of the man, or to the strength of the government; but, it will certainly tend to the internal tranquillity of France, and will induce foreigners to have greater confidence in any transactions with that country. It is impossible, as yet, to form any thing more than a mere guess as to what effect this change will have on the warlike enterprizes and projects of France; but, when we talk about Buonaparté's intention as to war or peace, we should never forget, that, though despotic in his office, though he possesses the power of life and death over every individual, yet that he himself is, under the control of the French disposition, of the ruling passion of Frenchmen, which is to see their country the mistress of the world. To this passion he must yield, whatever may be his own inclination; and, as long as he does yield to, and can afford it gratification, he will experience little opposition or inconvenience from either the royalists or the republicans. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose, that the imperial dignity, like the restoration of the Catholic religion, will, in some degree, become a means of extending the domination of France; but, it will, at the same time, strongly tend to keep the people of other countries, and of this kingdom in particular, united in support of their own government. The spell of republicanism is dissolved. The final effects of a revolution for liberty's sake are before the world. The success of Buonaparté does, indeed, afford a powerful stimulus to ambitious demagogues; but, the fate of the French people also affords an example, and this latter will operate in such a way as to deprive ambitious demagogues of materials to work upon. The question between England and France is, and long has been, simply a question of *power*; and, it will entirely depend upon the cabinet of London, whether we are to become the slaves of France, or not. It is very difficult to say, whether the French government will regard a continuation of the war, or the making of a peace with us, most likely to effect their object;

that is to say, the subjugation of these islands. They have formed a pretty accurate opinion of our situation. They clearly perceive all the effects which the mere name of war produces in this country. They adopt the maxim of Mr. Pitt, and knowing that "our national debt is the best ally of France," they do by no means regard as lost that time which is employed by them in adding to the strength of that ally. In short, they know, that, if we persevere in Mr. Pitt's systems, we must submit, on any terms, at the end of a very few years; and, they rely, perhaps with too good reason, on our want of sense and of virtue to get rid of those systems*.

* There are some persons, who affect to treat with contempt what Mr. Hautrive has published upon the subject of our resources; and, a Mr. Clarke, who sometime ago published a book entitled, "An Historical and Political View of the Disorganization of Europe, &c. &c." has undertaken—to *refute*? No; that would be too much; but to *contradict* M. Hautrive's opinion relative to the budgets of Mr. Pitt and the pamphlet of George Rose. Mr. Clarke's motive was, I dare say, very good; and, therefore, I must conclude, that when he spoke in *defence* of George Rose's pamphlet, he had never read, or, if he had read, he had not understood that pamphlet. Indeed, it is evident, that Mr. Clarke took up his pen upon this subject, without being duly prepared for it, as clearly appears from his own statement relative to the income of the nation, which is merely a copy of a garbled and partial statement brought forward to answer a momentary party purpose. Yet, from a statement like this, he goes on to draw conclusions; and, such conclusions, good heaven!—Mr. Clarke may be well assured, that Mr. Hautrive is not to be so easily put to silence. —One short extract from Mr. Clarke's book will furnish a standard whereby to measure the extent of his information and the profundity of his mind: "In 1799, it appeared, that the *future peace establishment* might be taken at £24,000,000. But, the gigantic strength of this nation manifested itself, and raised, *without any pressure of taxes on the poor, or on the majority of the English nation*, the vast supplies of £56,000,000; and, without the loan, which is included in the *former* sum, £38,000,000." Now, it is well known, that, in 1799, the annual charge on account of the debt alone, which charge admitted of no diminution, was £21,000,000: and, does Mr. Clarke mean to say, that all the other parts of the peace establishment, that

BANK DOLLARS — In the preceding sheet, p. 713, will be found a Letter addressed to me, on the subject of Dollars now issued by the Bank. But, previous to any remarks on that letter, it is proper to observe, that the plan of issuing re-stamped dollars has now been carried into execution, as will appear from the following notification: "Bank of England, May 12, 1804. The Court of Directors of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, with the approbation of his Majesty's most hon. Privy Council, having caused Dollars to be stamped at Mr. Boulton's Manufactory, with his Majesty's Head and an Inscription, 'Georgius III. Dei Gratia Rex' on the obverse, and Britannia, with the words 'Five Shillings, Dollar, Bank of England, 1804' on the reverse, which they propose to issue in-

the whole of the expenses of the government, army, navy, ordnance, &c. &c. does he mean to say, that all these would have been, in time of peace, defrayed with £3,000,000 a year? What does he mean then? Does he leave the annual charge on account of debt out of his calculation? If so, his peace establishment would be £45,000,000, that is to say, £8,000,000 more than the total of his income, which he correctly states at £38,000,000. Again, what very gigantic effort was it to raise £56,000,000, when £18,000,000 of it was borrowed of the Jews, and thrown forward as a load, a burden, and a badge of slavery, upon our children, if the system were to last? This was no very gigantic effort. And, in the names of truth, common sense, and common decency, on what principles or what facts does he found his assertion that the supplies of 1799 "were raised without any pressure of taxes on the poor, or on the majority of the English nation?" Does he imagine, that the income, and other direct taxes, though imposed upon the rich, do not reach the poor? And, if we were to admit that to be the case, does he not recollect, that, out of his £38,000,000, upwards of £25,000,000 arose from indirect taxes, of which every man, poor as well as rich, paid his proportion, even in the first instance?—In short, this gentleman is so manifestly unskilled in the science, of which he has thought proper to treat, that I should not have regarded it as necessary to take any notice at all of his work, had I not perceived it to be specially addressed to a Royal Duke; and, thereby, to have assumed an air of importance, to which, by its contents, it is by no means entitled.

“stead of the Dollars which have been
 “lately stamped at his Majesty’s Mint at
 “the Tower, the latter of which it is ex-
 “pedient to withdraw from Circulation,
 “hereby give notice, That those Dollars
 “which have been stamped at the Tower
 “since the 1st day of January last, and
 “which are now in circulation, will not be
 “current, nor be received at the Bank at
 “the rate of 5s. each, after the 2d day of
 “June next; and that from and after the
 “20th inst. until the said 2d day of June
 “inclusive, they may be exchanged for
 “Dollars with the new Stamp, or for Bank
 “Notes, after the rate of 5s. for each Dol-
 “lar. Attendance will be given at the
 “Bank for this purpose, on Monday the
 “21st inst. and the following Days (Sun-
 “days and the Fast-day excepted), until
 “Saturday the 2d day of June inclusive;
 “but to avoid confusion from a crowd of
 “persons applying at the same time, the
 “Court finds it necessary to give notice,
 “that smaller sums than Eight Dollars can-
 “not be exchanged at the Bank.—Signed
 “ROBERT BEST, Secretary.”—I have
 elsewhere remarked on the impropriety of
 thus forming a sort of partnership between
 the Crown and a Company of Traders, and
 of issuing current coin from the Bank instead
 of issuing it from the Tower; I have before
 observed on the probable consequences of
 this visible sign of close connexion between
 the Minister of the day and the Bank Direc-
 tors of the day. I shall, therefore, now con-
 fine myself to the letter of C. B. above re-
 ferred to.—Previous to the re-appearance
 of dollars as circulating coin, I had, on se-
 veral occasions, given it as my opinion, that
 the paper of the Bank of England had un-
 dergone a real, though not a nominal, de-
 preciation. When, therefore, it was an-
 nounced, that dollars were about to be issued,
 I observed, that the nominal value at which
 they would pass, would furnish us with a
proof, either of the correctness or incorrect-
 ness of my opinion: if, said I, the dollar
 passes, in company with bank paper, for no
 more than its sterling value, for no more
 than it used to pass for, then shall I say, that
 the paper is as good as it used to be, and of
 course, that it is *not* depreciated; but, if the
 dollar passes, in company with the paper, for
 more than its sterling value, for more than
 it used to pass in company with that pa-
 per, then shall I say, that the paper is not
 so good as it used to be, and, of course, that
 it is depreciated. The dollars appeared:
 their nominal value was five shillings, six-
 pence above that of their sterling value, ten
 per centum higher than they ever would

have exchanged for against English bank
 paper previous to the year 1796; therefore,
 agreeably to my previous declaration, I said,
 that we were now furnished with a *proof* of
 the real depreciation of Bank of England
 paper. To this proposition my correspondent,
 C. B. objected; and, it is to the arguments,
 upon which his objection was founded, that
 I shall now endeavour to reply. He sets out
 with re-stating what he had stated in a for-
 mer communication, to wit, “that the dol-
 “lar, as bullion, is worth no more than 4s.
 “9d. of bank paper; that the nominal va-
 “lue of 5s. has been affixed to it by the Bank,
 “merely to prevent it from being withdrawn
 “from circulation, if a considerable rise in
 “its bullion price should take place; that,
 “in order to give it currency at this advanced
 “nominal value, the Bank put a stamp on
 “it, thereby promising to take it back again
 “at 5s. whenever it should be presented;
 “that, it is not as a dollar that it now ap-
 “pears at 5s. but as a token, which the Bank
 “has engaged to repay at that price, or, in
 “other words, as a promissory note of the
 “Bank.” Well, if this be the case, then
 the Bank might have affixed *any* nominal
 value, however high, to the dollar; and,
 indeed, this C. B. asserts. “By using the
 “same means,” says he, “the Bank of Eng-
 “land could, if it pleased, have established
 “a nominal price of six, seven, or fifteen
 “shillings, or any price whatever.” Aye?
 Why, then it is the *stamp* and not the *metal*
 that gives the value to the Bank-dollar? But,
 if this were the case, why put the stamp
 upon dollars? Why upon silver? Why not
 choose a cheaper metal? Tin would have
 borne a stamp full as well, and would have
 been much lighter. And why have the
 piece so large? The size of a shilling would
 have done as well for a mere “*token*” as the
 size of a dollar.—Could C. B. be serious in
 making this statement! Is it possible that he
 could believe that even the credulous Cock-
 neys would be deceived by such means! Does he,
 in good earnest, think, that the bankers,
 by means of a stamp, could induce us to take a
 four-and-sixpenny dollar at fifteen shillings,
 or at “any price whatever!”—No; the stamped
 dollars are not to be considered as promissory
 notes. Those who take them consider them as
 having an intrinsic value; and, C. B. must be
 well aware, that they never would have cir-
 culated but from this consideration. To have
 attempted to issue pieces of tin with a five
 shilling stamp upon them, would have blown
 up the Bank at once, and five-shilling notes
 would have had an effect very little short of it.
 It is, then, the intrinsic value of the dollar,

and not the stamp, that makes the coin current; and, as that intrinsic value is now, relatively to paper, ten per centum higher than it used to be, relatively to the same paper, that paper has actually depreciated in the amount of ten per centum; and, of that depreciation, therefore, the enhanced nominal value of the dollar is the *proof*. Indeed, what has taken place in Ireland puts the matter beyond all dispute. There also dollars are in circulation; and, because the paper of that country has depreciated ten per centum more than the paper of England, the dollar there passes current for 5s. 6d. English money. What, then, becomes of all the reasoning of Mr. C. B.? He was informed of this fact by my Irish correspondent in p. 641; but this information reached him after he had favoured me with his letter, and, therefore, he sent me a postscript, in which he observes: "I do not know of any circumstance which can have raised the price of dollars in Ireland to the rate they bear there, *except it be allowed that the paper of that country has suffered depreciation.*" Certainly this is allowed. This it is that has raised the price of dollars in Ireland; and this it is also, that has raised the price of dollars here. Here the paper has depreciated just half as much as it has in Ireland, and here, therefore, the dollar has risen in its circulating value only half as much as it has risen there. C. B. will excuse me, if I suspect, that, if, previous to the date of his letter of the 30th of April, he had been acquainted with the current rate of dollars in Dublin, I never should have been honoured with that letter, the theory of which is completely upset by the Irish practice.—There is another part of C. B.'s letter which I think it right just to notice. I allude to a passage in p. 716, where he seems to imagine, that he has detected me in an inconsistency, in having argued, "that dollars are not depreciated, and that guineas are depreciated; and," says he, "did it never occur to you, that it was necessary to explain to your readers how this extraordinary circumstance had come to pass? Did you expect to be believed, upon your bare assertion of the fact, that the same broth was, at the same time, both hot and cold?" Now, I appeal to this gentleman's candour, whether I ever did, in any shape, argue, that dollars were not depreciated. What occasion was there for such an argument, when I was maintaining, that dollars were passing for the full of their worth? If he will new-model his question, and ask me, how it comes to pass, that, in company with depreciated paper, the dollar

at present supports its full sterling value, while the guinea participates hitherto in the depreciation of the paper? My answer is short and plain, to wit, the current value of the dollar has been fixed *since* the paper has been in a depreciated state, whereas the current price of the guinea was fixed *before* the paper began to depreciate. The arguments by which I have endeavoured to establish my position, that gold and silver, having a fixed current value, depreciate to a certain point in company with a depreciating paper, will be found in p. 572 and 573; and, as I perceive that C. B. has taken the trouble to read those pages, I must confess myself somewhat surprized, that he should ask me, if I expect to be believed upon my "bare assertion of the fact?"—Before I take my leave of this gentleman, I cannot refrain from remarking, that he appears quite to have forgotten to explain, or even to mention, that very important circumstance, the difference between the current value of the dollars which are stamped *now*, and that of the dollars which were stamped *six years ago*. That value was then 4s. 9d. it is now 5s. He will say, perhaps, that dollars are dearer in the "market," as he calls it, now than they were then. *Dearer!* how so? Why are they dearer? How does he know that they are? Why; because a ten pound note, which would formerly purchase $44\frac{1}{2}$ dollars, will now purchase only $42\frac{1}{2}$ dollars. This is the fact whence he concludes that dollars have *risen* in value, and it is from the same fact that I conclude that paper has *fallen*; and, if my conclusion is erroneous, I beg of him to explain to me, how it happens, that, *in all other countries*, the British colonies not excepted, dollars keep their steady value, and, in all payments, pass for 4s. 6d. sterling money.—Mr. C. B. expressly disclaims any intention to offer even an opinion upon the question, whether the currency of this country has depreciated or not; yet, if his object be not to maintain the negative of that question, it is hard to say what his object is. Upon this subject, therefore, I beg leave to quote, for his consideration, a passage from a pamphlet, just published, from the pen of Mr. Magens Dorian Magens. "By such conduct" [in the Bank] "paper and specie would be rendered equally valuable; *by no means the case at present*, and for this plain reason, that the quantity of gold or silver, promised to be paid for a ten pound bank note, is *not to be procured for it*, putting the effect of the restriction law out of the question; for, take this note to buy bullion, and, instead of the specific quantity of gold and

"silver which it represents, it will purchase only a diminished quantity. In plain terms, the one pound note does not exchange for twenty shillings sterling money, but only for eighteen shillings." Now, this gentleman is a banker and a member of parliament, I believe. His statement is quite unequivocal; and, I am fully persuaded, that it is perfectly incontrovertible.

SINKING FUND.—In page 719 will be found an essay, taken from the Royal Cornwall Gazette. The object which the writer professes to have in view, is, to present to all "true hearted and loyal Britons" the comforting prospect of a *speedy* discharge of the national debt, and a termination to all taxes, *except to defray the current expenses of the year, amounting to only about thirty millions!*—Upon this essay I shall make only a remark or two.—The writer says, that the whole of the debt will be paid off by the year 1832; but, the venerable Doctor Addington, in the last set of resolutions, which he got the "guardians of the public purse" to pass, says that it will not be paid off till 1843. The Reading Doctor and the Cornish Doctor disagree; but, it may be safely averred, that the statement of one is just as correct as that of the other.—The Cornish Doctor is of opinion, that "the lower the stocks are, the more advantageous will it be for the sinking fund; and, for this reason, the effect of that fund will be greater in war, when the price of stocks is low, than in peace, when it is higher. So that the war itself, which, we are told, is to ruin our finances, will accelerate their re-establishment." So, the comfort of this "true hearted Briton" increases with the decline of the price of stocks! But, if to lower the price of stocks be to accelerate the re-establishment of our finances, I beg I may never again hear any out-cry against my financial doctrines. This man pretty broadly insinuates that I am no well-wisher to my country, because I have no opinion of the good effects of a fund, which, he says, is to thrive by the ruin of the stocks! And yet he is a *defender* of the funding system! According to him, the lower the stocks fall, the better it will be for the country, because the sooner will the national debt be paid off, and the sooner shall we get rid of the enormous annual charge on account of it; and, therefore, it would, of course, be a most joyful circumstance if the stocks immediately fell down to one per cent., or, indeed, much less, so that they might all be bought up by the Commissioners, to-morrow morning, fresh and fasting. And, to effect this most desirable object, if war be too slow in its ope-

ration, the Cornish financier would, without doubt, wish for a temporary rebellion, or something of that sort, which would exactly answer his purpose! Nay; this is the natural result of his reasoning, and, yet he has the conscience to ask us to give him "credit for his motives," and to believe that he wishes to "animate his countrymen to bear their burdens cheerfully!"—The conclusion of the essay is too curious to pass entirely unnoticed. It is worthy of great attention, as exhibiting a striking instance of the delusion, which, relative to the funding system, prevails even amongst men of sense and education. "I trust," says he, "that the system of the sinking fund will be persevered in to its fullest extent. But, should the exigencies of the times ever require its suspension, it will be seen by what is here submitted to the public, that, by suspending its operation for the moment, funds adequate to any emergency, or pecuniary embarrassment, may be obtained, without laying an extraordinary load upon the people. For instance, in the present year, by suspending the operation of the sinking fund, there would be, in case of invasion, or other unfortunate casualty, 6,311,526l. at the disposal of government; and, in case of greater emergency, by suspending the operation of the sinking fund altogether, there would be 77,698,467l. at the disposal of government!"—Now, this person appears to be perfectly sane; his mind is capable of laborious calculations; he writes grammatically; and, in short, seems to have received an education and to possess talents superior, perhaps, to the education and talents of ninety-nine out of every hundred men in the kingdom. What a delusion then, what a glorious humbug, must this funding system be! For this man really thinks, that, if it be not convenient to go on buying up stock, the commissioners can stop for a year, or so, without injuring the stability of the funds! And he imagines, that, in case of a very pressing emergency, such as a formidable invasion, the commissioners could turn the 77,000,000l. of stock into money, and place it at the disposal of government! "And this," says he, "while it must raise our spirits, if they require at all to be raised, must damp those of our inveterate foes!"—I shall only add one short remark, and that is, that it is for Mr. Pitt to consider what will be, what *must be*, the consequence, when events shall have dissipated this apparently impenetrable cloud.

THE NEW MINISTRY seems to be pretty

nearly formed, and, in the course of a week or ten days the public may expect to hear of them through their measures. Till all the members are regularly appointed, it would be useless to give any list of them; but, when it is known that Lord Camden is the War-Secretary, that Lord Harrowby has the charge of the Foreign Department, and that the Dundases have, at one grasp, seized on both the army and navy, no one can be accused of want of candour if he anticipates a plentiful harvest of prodigality, blunders, and disgrace. Mr. Canning, for whom, after all, one cannot help feeling some compassion, exclaimed, in the speech, from which my motto is taken, "away with the measures and give us the men! It is not the harness," said he, "but the horses, that draw the carriage." But, it is not *men*; it is *a man*, to whom the affairs of the kingdom are now committed. A superabundance of harness, but only one horse, and that one not of the very best kind for a carriage and for roads such as these. "What," said he, "has made France? *A man*. France had the elements of strength in herself, no doubt; but look to her situation at the time Buonaparté assumed the government, and compare it with her imposing attitude now. What has produced the mighty difference? The genius of *a man*." True, Sir, but of a man very different indeed from your Right Honourable Friend; a man who does not trust to an army of ballotted and small-bounty men; a real soldier, and not a generalissimo of shop-keepers; a man remarkable for his taciturnity, for the slowness of his speech and the celerity of his movements; and, which is, indeed, the most material difference, a man, who, though fifty millions of people are under his control, though an imperial diadem waits his brow, though the civilized world trembles at his frown, has never, for a moment, excluded men of great weight and talents from a participation in his counsels. One would have thought, too, that, in referring to the time and circumstances of Buonaparté's exaltation, Mr. Canning must have recollected, that the genius of *the man* of France was opposed to that of *the man* of Mr. Canning, and that to acknowledge the "imposing attitude" of that country was, in fact, to prefer a very serious charge against Mr. Pitt. But, upon this subject more hereafter.—One of the new Treasury prints, in laying down the principles upon which a ministry ought to be formed, has observed, that "a ministry, like a family, should have *a head*." Nothing could be more happily descriptive of the

present set of persons in office. Mr. Pitt is the papa, Lord Melville the mama, or, rather, the old Mère Abesse: all the rest are mere children or novices. So have we seen, and so do we daily see, the haughty strutting Chanticleer stretching out his neck, clapping his wings, and crowing aloud, the sole master of his dunghill; while dame Partlet below, with raking claw and busy beak, leaves no particle of filth unturned in seeking to gratify the greediness of herself and her clamorous brood.—In the making up of this hen-and-chicken ministry it is, however, at first sight, somewhat strange, that Lord Hawkesbury should have been retained in it; for, it must be well remembered, that the blame which Mr. Long tells us Mr. Pitt imputed to the late ministry was confined almost entirely to the management of our *foreign affairs*. Indeed, as to the Doctor's immediate department, nothing had therein been done which Mr. Pitt could find fault with, without passing sentence upon his own measures. How, then, comes Lord Hawkesbury to be chosen as the proper person to remain? Are we told, that he is now transplanted to another office? Why could not Mr. Yorke have remained in that other office? And, let it be recollected, too, that it was as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that Mr. Pitt declared Lord Hawkesbury to be equal to any man in the kingdom, Mr. Fox and *himself* excepted. The keeping in of Lord Hawkesbury, Lord Castlereagh, the Chancellor, and the Attorney-General, especially when we recollect the difference between the parliamentary language of those gentlemen and that of their colleagues, respecting Mr. Pitt, does really corroborate an opinion that was long ago entertained, that is, that there was an understanding and even an arrangement, having an eye to what has now happened, between Mr. Pitt and part of the late ministry. Mr. Yorke, Mr. Addington, and Mr. Bragge expressed their *disapprobation* of Mr. Pitt's army of reserve project, for instance. Lord Castlereagh did not. The Attorney-General, when he acknowledged, that the object of the debate and division was to turn out the ministry, said that he should have no objection to see Mr. Pitt enter the cabinet, provided he *shut the door against Mr. Fox*. Many other circumstances might be pointed out, all tending to strengthen this opinion.—How Mr. Canning feels himself in such company it is hard to say; but, if any one had told him, four years ago, that he would, at the end of four years, find himself in a situation far beneath that of Lord Hawkes-

bury, he would not have had patience to listen to the prediction. Not that Mr. Canning's situation is not high enough, and lucrative enough; but, the marked circumstance is, that he should be merely Treasurer of the Navy, a mere receiver of four thousand a year, while "Hawkey" is a Secretary of State and a cabinet minister!—With respect to what Mr. Pitt said, or did not say, to the King, on the subject of Mr. Fox's admission into the cabinet, it is, as was before observed, next to impossible, that we should obtain correct information; but, that it has been his unvarying policy to divide all the other great men in the country from one another, to set them at variance, and thereby to rule as absolute master himself, is a truth, which, I think, will be denied by no one who has paid the least attention to his conduct since the commencement of the year 1801. At that time, he wished to make peace, which, upon the terms to which he was ready to consent, he knew he could not easily accomplish with the lords Spencer and Grenville and Mr. Windham in the cabinet. He therefore fell upon that famous device, the Catholic Question, as a ground for retiring from office, together with his colleagues. Having pushed the matter to that length, that they all became bound, "in duty and in honour," to quit their places; having seen the noblemen and gentleman above-named fairly out of his way, he did, we are told by Mr. Long, "make a distinct offer to retain *his own* situation, *until the war should be concluded, and the country relieved from its most pressing difficulties.*" That is to say, until the end of his natural life. Mr. Long declares, that such an offer was made by Mr. Pitt. The public may rest assured, that lords Spencer and Grenville and Mr. Windham never heard a word of such an offer, till they read an account of it, last November, in the pamphlet of Mr. Long; and, that public will have already asked, what reason was there that could have induced Mr. Pitt to remain alone, which would not also have induced his colleagues to remain? If they retired, because they were "bound in duty and in honour" so to do, how could he *alone* have remained, consistently with that honour and that duty? These are questions which have been asked before, but they are now repeated with singular propriety. Having got rid of lords Spencer and Grenville and Mr. Windham, he would have filled their places nearly in the same way that they were filled by Mr. Addington; and, he would have had no apprehensions from the opposition of his late colleagues, because, upon all questions either of peace or

war, he foresaw that they must necessarily be opposed to the party of Mr. Fox. Thus he would have recovered his absolute sway in the cabinet, at the same time that he ruled the parliament by so managing his measures as to keep his opponents divided. Not succeeding in retaining his place while his colleagues retired, he placed in his stead a person, over whom he expected to exercise, and over whom he did long exercise, an absolute control. The object of peace was effected; and, by the late disclosures, we learn that he soon afterwards became discontented with Mr. Addington. By means of an intrigue of lord Melville, we find him negotiating for return to power, in March, 1803. But, he would not be shackled; he would be sent for by the King; he would name his own ministry; he proposed to make it up of the members of the late and the present cabinets; but, he himself would form it; and he mentioned lords Spencer and Grenville as persons whom he should propose to the King. If the King consented to take them, and they consented to come, he divided them from Mr. Windham. If only one of them came, still he divided the New Opposition, which, as standing upon the strong ground of having disapproved of the peace, had gained very great weight with the nation. If either or both of them came, they only came to add to his slaves in the new-modelled cabinet; and, if neither of them came, why then he was the more absolute in the cabinet, and entertained not the least apprehension of being able to keep the Old and New Oppositions in a constant state of division and irritation. That project having also failed, he set himself to work to overturn his creature, who had dared, like an electioneering occupant, to regard as *his own* that which he had been put in possession of merely to answer a temporary purpose of his patron. To turn out Mr. Addington for the sake of putting Mr. Pitt in his place, or, to confine the change to their immediate friends, the parliament and the nation regarded as by no means likely to produce any effect worth even the pensions which the change would inevitably impose. A ministry upon a broad scale and a liberal principle was what all men wished for. To this sentiment, therefore, Mr. Pitt found it necessary, in appearance at least, to give way; and, those who had been the most attentive observers of his conduct, were agreeably surprized at being assured by his friends, that he had determined to lend his hearty co-operation in forming a ministry such as the times demanded and as was expected by the people. All this while, however, it now appears, that he was only contriving how he should make such an arrange-

ment as to secure a decided majority in parliament, without depriving himself of the absolute command in the the cabinet. He is said to have mentioned Mr. Fox to the King, to have even laboured to overcome the King's objection; but, never let it be forgotten, that, from his subsequent conduct, it is evident, that he *must* have gone to the King with a determination to form a ministry without Mr. Fox, because one of the *preliminaries* was, that Mr. Fox should not come in with him, a preliminary which, it is not altogether impossible, he himself might cause to be proposed. At any rate, to form a ministry he resolved without Mr. Fox; and then, as there appeared to be an understanding growing up between the New and Old Oppositions, effectually to separate them was the next step. Had he not had this object in view, he never would have offered to include Lords Spencer and Grenville and Mr. Windham, who, with the additional weight which they had acquired since they left the cabinet, might become rather troublesome colleagues, though unable to oppose an efficient resistance to him. But, their union with the Old Opposition he was not very willing to encounter; and, therefore, he used his utmost endeavours to prevent that union. Here he failed too. Those noblemen and that gentleman appear to have perceived his views, and to have felt no inclination to lend their name and support to measures in the framing or adopting of which they would have had no share. They had once before been in a cabinet with Mr. Pitt, Lord Melville, and their creatures. His partisans tell us, that, though he could not admit Mr. Fox, he was very willing to receive a reasonable proportion of that gentleman's friends. No doubt of it; for he thereby would have broken up the Old Opposition. Nor have I any difficulty in believing, that "Mr. Fox was offered a very high and important situation abroad, even equal in extent of diplomatic power to that of the Duke of Marlborough." Mr. Pitt would, doubtless, have given him a roving commission to treat in every country in Europe; and, if he had chosen to go out of Europe, if he had wished to embark on a voyage of discovery to find new nations to treat with, I dare say that Lord Melville would have lost no time in fitting out a ship for his reception. Baffled in all these schemes, some persons thought, that Mr. Pitt would return to the King, and

confess his inability to form an administration upon a principle of proscription; but, twenty years of a successful political life, united with his own native courage, give him a degree of confidence not easily shaken. He has determined to enter the cabinet surrounded with creatures only, and, as to the Parliament, to trust to his dexterity and strength in throwing the apple of discord, occasions for doing which will, he imagines, soon and frequently occur. His hopes and expectations may be disappointed; but let his opponents beware. Let the necessity of *mutual concession* never be lost sight of amongst them. Let them never forget, that they have only this choice: to yield to one another, or to submit to Mr. Pitt; to wear the bands of friendship, or the badge of defeat.—The first principle of his policy always has been to break up every connexion that was likely to throw an obstacle in the way of his ambition. This ambition is, too, entirely unconnected with the interest, or the glory, of either his Sovereign or his country. It is a love of individual power; a mere desire to rule; a passion for domineering over other men. He never has, at any period of his political life, shown a disposition to make a fair and liberal distribution of power. Nothing like a *council* will a cabinet of his choosing ever exhibit; but an assemblage of servants with a master at their head; a troop of followers, to whom he can, like the Centurion, "say unto one man, go, and he goeth; to another, come, and he cometh; and to this man, do this, and he doeth it." And, shall the Lords Spencer and Grenville and Mr. Windham be accused of forsaking their aged and beloved Sovereign and their country, because they shun a situation, which has in it nothing belonging to a cabinet, but the name? Shall they be accused of wishing to *force* a ministry upon their King, because they decline the honour of becoming the automata of Mr. Pitt? When people express regret, that these gentlemen should, at an awful crisis like the present, "with-hold their services from the state," such people seem not to be aware, that, it was not their *services* in the cabinet, but their *silence* in the Parliament, which Mr. Pitt was desirous of securing; and that, to have fallen into the train of his menial counsellors, would have been to nullify their character and their talents, would have been, in reality, to abandon their country and their King.